

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
10

11 PETER SHARMA,  
12 Plaintiff(s),

13 v.

14 STATE OF ARIZONA,  
15 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-02086-GMN-NJK

**TRANSFER ORDER**

16 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and  
17 Plaintiff's proposed complaint. Docket Nos. 1, 1-1. The federal venue statute requires that a civil  
18 action be brought in (1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants reside  
19 in the same state where the district is located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of  
20 the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is  
21 the subject of the action is situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant is subject to  
22 personal jurisdiction at the time the action is commenced, if there is no district in which the action  
23 may otherwise be brought. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). If a case has been filed in the wrong district, the  
24 district court in which the case has been incorrectly filed has the discretion to transfer such case to  
25 any district in which it could have been brought. 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); *see also Parks v. Johnson*,  
26 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis. 16284, \*1 (D. Nev. Feb. 9, 2016).

27 In this case, Plaintiff's claims arise out of alleged events taking place in Maricopa County,  
28 Arizona. *See* Docket No. 1-1. In particular, Plaintiff alleges that certain of his constitutional rights

1 were violated by the State of Arizona in the criminal proceedings against Plaintiff in Arizona. *See*  
2 *id.* Plaintiff has not alleged any connection of any kind between his claims and this District. None  
3 of the above venue provisions renders this district a proper venue for this case.

4 Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court transfer this matter to the  
5 District of Arizona (Phoenix division) and that this case be closed.<sup>1</sup>

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: November 8, 2018

8  
9   
Nancy J. Koppe  
United States Magistrate Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  

---

1 An order transferring venue does not address the merits of the case and, therefore, is a nondispositive matter that is within the province of a magistrate judge's authority under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). *See Pavao v. Unifund CCR Partners*, 934 F. Supp. 2d 1238, 1241 (S.D. Cal. 2013) (collecting cases); *see also Ross v. Lane Community College*, 2014 WL 3783942, \*4 (D. Nev. July 31, 2014) (holding that a transfer under 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a) is a nondispositive matter).